

ENTERED

October 11, 2023

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

DANIEL BENAVIDEZ,

Plaintiff,

VS.

NUECES COUNTY, TEXAS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:21-CV-00194

ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION


On September 21, 2023, United States Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton issued her “Memorandum and Recommendation” (M&R, D.E. 45), recommending that Plaintiff’s “Motion for Leave to File Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint and/or Reconsider Dismissal of Defendant County” (D.E. 43) be denied. The parties were provided proper notice of, and opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge’s M&R. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); General Order No. 2002-13. No objections have been timely filed.

When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s M&R is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s M&R. *Guillory v. PPG Indus., Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (citing *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)).

Having reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge’s M&R (D.E. 45), and all other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** as its own the findings and conclusions of the

Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the motion for leave to file first amended complaint and/or reconsider dismissal of Defendant County (D.E. 43) is **DENIED**.

ORDERED on October 11, 2023.


NELVA GONZALES RAMOS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE